



Public Comment Received for:
Item 3: 601 Santa Barbara St
(PLN2020-00627)

Name of Sender	Distributed prior to hearing	Distributed after the hearing
1. Dan Fleury	x	
2. Richard Untermann	x	

From: [Dan Fleury](#)
To: [Community Development ABRsecretary](#)
Subject: 601 Santa Barbara Street - Public Comment
Date: Sunday, October 23, 2022 9:05:57 AM

You don't often get email from dfleury01@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL

Dear Secretary,

Please place me on the "Interested Party" list to receive updates on the proposed development of the new police station at 601 Santa Barbara Street. I live at 617 Garden Street and our driveway exits on Cota Street between Santa Barbara Street and Garden. When I have to go to work on those days we have a Farmer's Market it is a challenge to exit our property with all the foot traffic. Pedestrians have to negotiate private driveways all along this entire area to get to the Farmer's Market. I am looking forward to the construction of the new development here and am sure that the Farmer's Market can find a safer location to host their visitors.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Fleury
617 Garden Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
(805) 636-1709
Dfleury01@gmail.com

From: [Richard Untermann](#)
To: [Community Development ABRsecretary](#)
Subject: Comments on the Proposed Police Station
Date: Friday, November 11, 2022 1:08:44 PM

EXTERNAL

Santa Barbara Architectural Board of Review

Re: Police Station EIR – Negative Declaration

Dear Commission members

Most of the issues surrounding the appropriateness of this Proposal are environmental, but these issues are also imbedded in your ABR review. Maybe the Police Station can be saved, but it has so many conditions against it, it will be an uphill battle.

First, there are many more environmentally friendly options not addressed in the planning process, or EIR - Here are some of the reasons:

The report skims every issue – no problems anywhere. How can you build almost three and a half acres of building (150,000 square feet) and not have any impacts – particular in this time of energy concerns, climate change, housing needs, and waste reduction.

The site is zoned for HOUSING PRIORITY. Why give up a prime housing site for a use that can fit into many other buildings or places?

There are no “alternatives evaluated – a typical part of the EIR reports. There are many alternatives – reusing the existing Police Station; decentralizing with parts of the program house elsewhere (at lower costs) using the very popular Community Policing model, with sub stations in different neighbors, etc.

There is no precise measure of GHG created with the removal and replacement of mature tree with new sapling trees. These new trees will take at least 25 years to reach the same maturity, meanwhile all the carbon capture and storm water capture that mature trees perform will be lost.

The visual /aesthetic is inadequate – replacing what is probably Santa Barbara’s most attractive parking lot with two over 50-foot-tall buildings in a major visual alteration – particular with contrasted with the small cottages in the adjacent. Neighborhood. There is no mention of visual offsets, just lots of words that obfuscate and suggest the preparers were at a loss to find offsets.

The number of constructions related trips to the site, and the carbon footprint is vastly under counted. Assuming 2200 project vehicles amounts to only 3 per day over the 22-month construction period This project could have 25 trips per day and still be undercounted. There is no mention of alternative worker access during construction. Construction workers typically don’t carpool, and so each job has dozens of cars and trucks - each driving long distances because of Santa Barbara’s housing shortage. What is their GHG creation, what mitigation (i.e., buses carpools, MTD passes, tool lockers,etc.)

Excavating for the basement will require at least 233 trucks loads, resulting in substantial GHG for removal, transit, and trip returns. There is no mention of disposal sites – will it be in Ventura or Lompok, what is the distance traveled. There will be dozens of cars and trucks necessary for the material delivery and trades trucks and worker vehicles to construct such a complicated building. How many GHG do they create, and what are the offsets?

Demolition of 390 cubic yards seems low. If the site was cleared by just one foot, it would amount to 2339 cubic yards of dirt, rubble, asphalt, or approximately 233 truck trips. That creates a substantial carbon footprint, and

complicated traffic pattern, yet no description of offsets.

There seems to be no attempt to reduce the size of the building through creative planning and architecture. Reducing is a prime method to lower GHG and reduce costs. There is no mention of using low carbon cement and steel – the two major construction materials in such an earthquake structure. There is no mention of an all-wood building – more common every day in a climate change, low carbon footprint.

Building a 275-car garage at this time of traffic congestion, and increased GHG alternative options, is inappropriate and environmentally unfriendly. Surely there can be creative use of the MTD, electric bikes carpooling, buses (think Cottage Hospital). What is the Carbon footprint, and what are the offsets?

I am surprised that a Committee of the Parks and Recreation Department approved the destruction of the mature existing trees on City property. I have never heard - in my long career - of a unanimous vote by people who are charged to defend nature. (Time to get a new Parks Committee who will defend Parks purposes)

The effects of GHG emissions seems under counted. For instance, the environmental and carbon generated by demolishing the EXISTING Police Station and replacing it with another use should be counted in this EIR. What are the offsets? more trees, new solar facilities, etc.

Storm Water management seem seriously under reported While a 25-year storm may be the minimum requirements, in this time of climate change, there are more intense and complex storms. We need to calculate for something like a 100--year event.

The list of serious environment issues, and lack of mitigating measure goes on, but I will stop for now. Please send the plans back to the planners and architects for a sharper look, and probably more change

I have sent letters to the City Manager, and most Council members over the years.

Sincerely,

Rich Untermann

Professor Emeritus
Urban Planning and Design
University of Washington
Seattle Washington